

MINUTES OF HARRISONBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
March 10, 2010

The Harrisonburg Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Wednesday, March 10, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 409 South Main Street.

Members present: Richard Baugh, Charles Chenault, Muawia Da'Mes, Bill Jones and J.M. Snell.

Members absent: Alan Finks and Deb Fitzgerald.

Also present: Stacy Turner, Director of Planning and Community Development; Adam Fletcher, City Planner; Alison Banks, Planner and Secretary.

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order and determined there was a quorum with five of seven members in attendance. He then asked for review and approval of the minutes from the February 10, 2010 regular Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Chenault moved to approve the minutes.

Mr. Da'Mes seconded the motion.

All voted in favor of approving the minutes. (5-0)

New Business

Rezoning – 1351 North Main Street (HRCSB)

Chairman Jones read the request and asked staff to summarize.

Mr. Fletcher said the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Public / Semi-Public. This designation includes both existing and proposed public and semi-public use. They include lands owned or leased by the Commonwealth of Virginia (except for institutions of higher learning), the federal government, the City of Harrisonburg, and other governmental organizations.

The following land uses are located on and adjacent to the property:

Site: Two-story structure, used as office space, zoned B-2C

North: Dwelling unit, zoned R-2

East: Across North Main Street, non-conforming dwelling unit, zoned M-1 and the Blakely Court townhouse community (under construction), zoned R-4

South: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Community Services Board offices, zoned B-2

West: Parking area serving Harrisonburg Rockingham Community Services Board, zoned B-2

The Harrisonburg Rockingham Community Services Board (HRCSB) is requesting to amend proffers on their 0.46 +/- acre parcel zoned B-2C, General Business District Conditional. Located along North Main Street, this parcel is one of five properties that make up HRCSB's campus, which totals approximately 4.3 acres. Their four adjacent properties are zoned B-2. The purpose of the rezoning is to remove the existing proffers and to potentially build an additional structure to house a Crisis Stabilization Unit (CSU). In reality, HRCSB has enough property that would allow the construction of an additional building for a CSU use, without going through the rezoning process; however, the desired location for the building would straddle the zoning boundary between their B-2 and B-2C zoned property, and therefore requires the rezoning.

A Crisis Stabilization Unit, or CSU, is a supervised residential program that provides a location for adults to stay for no longer than 15 days, who may be experiencing a mental health crisis.

Individuals, who may be in transition to the community, after inpatient psychiatric care, may also take advantage of this program. As noted by HRCSB, the program would be staffed around the clock by trained mental health professionals. The program would not accept individuals who are dangerous or with a primary diagnosis of substance abuse. Additionally, the program would be licensed by the Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Development Services and would operate in conformity with regulations of the Virginia Department of Medical Assistance Services. The Crisis Stabilization Program is contingent upon available funding; however HRCSB is organizing their efforts to be prepared to move forward with the program.

In 2000, HRCSB successfully rezoned the subject parcel from R-2 to B-2C. Since taking ownership of the property, HRCSB has used the cape cod-style, single family structure for office and business space. The existing proffers specify the 0.46-acre property can only be used for the following:

- Mercantile establishments which promote the show, sale and rental of goods, personal service establishment, and other shops or stores customary to shopping centers and convenience outlets, *excluding* restaurants and night clubs.
- Governmental, business and professional offices and financial institutions.
- Theaters, community rooms, museums and galleries and other places of assembly for the purpose of entertainment or education, including customary recreational and leisure-time activities which are compatible with surrounding uses, but *excluding* movie theaters.
- Religious, education, charitable or benevolent institutional uses which do not provide housing facilities.
- General service or repair shops that do not generate excessive noise, require outside storage or generate truck traffic.
- Radio and television stations and studios or recording studios, *excluding* those having antennae or communications towers.
- Public utilities, public service or public transportation uses or buildings, *excluding* utility generating, purification or treatment plants; water storage tanks; pumping or regulator stations; telephone exchange and transformer or substations.
- Warehousing and other storage facilities with floor area limited to 20,000 square feet, which are contiguous to permitted uses in the B-2 district, *excluding* wholesale or retail warehousing.
- Funeral homes.
- Public and privately owned parking lots and parking garages.
- Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to any of the above listed uses.
- Research and development activities which do not cause any more smoke, dust, odor, noise, vibration or danger of explosion than other uses permitted in this district and which involve no more than 15% of the gross floor area in the assembling or processing of products. Any assembling or processing shall only involve products developed on the premises. All services and storage shall be conducted within the principal structure which is to be completely enclosed.
- Plant nurseries and greenhouses provided any outside storage of materials, other than plants, must be screened.
- Public Uses.
- Uses hereafter approved by the Planning Commission upon request of the owner, and uses for which a special use permit is obtained pursuant to the ordinances of the City of Harrisonburg.

- Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Agent, no improvements hereafter constructed on the property shall exceed three stories or 40 feet in height.

If approved, all uses as specified in the B-2 district would be permitted.

As mentioned above, the purpose of the application is to rezone the 0.46-acre property by removing the existing proffers. This is necessary as the existing proffers do not permit hotels, motels and similar transient accommodations, which is how the CSU use would be categorized. Although not proffered, HRCSB's plan is to maintain the single family structure and to remove the property boundaries to make way for the CSU building. This structure would be built directly behind the existing cape cod building and would be two stories—slightly lower in height than their adjacent main office building. No additional parking is planned or is necessary as HRCSB currently exceeds their parking requirements.

HRCSB has submitted one proffer with their application, which includes erecting a privacy fence that would extend from the front, right corner of the existing single family structure, and then turn northwestward and ultimately connect with the privacy fence that already stands on their property. (An illustration depicting the fence's location is provided within your packet.)

Although the adjoining property to the north is used and zoned residentially, staff does not believe there would be negative impacts to this property, and therefore has no concerns with this application. As already mentioned, if the rezoning were denied, HRCSB could still build the planned building and utilize it in a different manner and/or relocate the building several feet to the west and continue with their plans for the CSU use. The proffered privacy fence should help buffer the planned building and use from the residential property to the north while also providing solitude for those receiving help from HRCSB. Furthermore, other than the HRCSB-owned properties, which are designated public/semi public by the Comprehensive Plan, the surrounding properties are designated as Commercial, and therefore this application is in conformance with the City's long term plans.

Staff supports a favorable recommendation to amend the proffers on this B-2C property.

Chairman Jones asked if there were any questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant or applicant's representative would like to speak.

Mr. Lacy Whitmore, Executive Director of the Harrisonburg Rockingham Community Services Board, said that his office is located in the 1241 North Main Street office building of the HRCSB, and we have a number of locations around town. I want to give a few brief comments about the program proposed for this location. Currently, we already have individuals coming to the CSB on a daily basis, who are either in crisis, or perhaps on the slippery slope of a crisis. Part of the intent of this program is for us to be able to provide a safe, welcoming, twenty-four hour a day environment next door to our office, where we can share staff and resources. This facility would allow us to invite someone to a "time-out" place before their crisis gets worse or possibly heads to an emergency situation that may result in hospitalization. Our hope is to have a seven bed program, staffed twenty-four hours a day by mental health professionals that would be able to provide a safe and welcoming spot for a "time-out." These individuals are primarily people that we are already seeing at the next door location on a day-to-day basis. We will be in full compliance with the many State regulations regarding this type of facility.

I have met with the adjoining home owner twice and he is very willing to work with us on this venture; we designed the proffered fence with input from him. We feel that we also have positive

input from other neighbors in this area. I would appreciate your consideration on this matter and if you have questions regarding the building or the site, both the project architect and engineer are here to answer those questions.

Chairman Jones asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the request. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Chenault moved to recommend approval of the rezoning. This is a great location for this campus; it is a good transitional use of the property between what is existing and what possibly could be constructed in the commercial and industrial zoned areas.

Mr. Snell seconded the motion.

Chairman Jones said there is a motion to recommend approval and a second. He then called for a voice vote on the matter.

All voted in favor of the motion to recommend approval. (5-0)

Mr. Fletcher said this will go before City Council on April 13th.

Rezoning – EMU Master Plan Change 2010

Chairman Jones read the request and asked staff to report.

Mrs. Banks said the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Institutional. These lands are designated for development by certain nonprofit and public institutional uses such as colleges and universities, hospitals, offices of nonprofit organizations, community assembly uses and institutions which provide for the shelter and care of people.

The following land uses are located on and adjacent to the property:

- Site: Educational, recreational and residential buildings, parking lots, and common area associated with the University, zoned R-3 / I-1
- North: Park View neighborhood, zoned R-2
- East: Eastern Mennonite High School, zoned R-3 / I-1
- South: Across Mount Clinton Pike, commercial uses, zoned B-2 and residential uses, zoned R-2
- West: Village Square townhouses and residential uses, zoned R-3

Eastern Mennonite University (EMU) is requesting to make modifications to their master plan, which was originally approved in 1998. During the original proposal EMU illustrated their existing campus layout and depicted where additions to building and parking lots were planned. The I-1, Institutional Overlay District requires master plan approval, which permits flexibility with setbacks, building heights, and parking regulations. Over the past twelve years several buildings and parking lots have been constructed in compliance with the approved plan. The proposed amendments to the master plan include illustrating where the university would like to incorporate structures that would provide energy from solar panels, making modifications to maximum building height, relocating building additions, and to incorporate new property into the plan. EMU consists of several parcels, totaling 91.89 acres, which are bound by Mount Clinton Pike, Dogwood Drive, Virginia Mennonite Retirement Community, and Eastern Mennonite High School. This amendment only takes into

account a 42.9 +/- acre portion of the EMU campus, those parcels of the campus which are directly south and west of Parkwood Road.

EMU recently re-examined the 1998 master plan to see if it needed updating in order to reflect the ever changing conditions that affect the school and campus. One area that EMU saw as a priority for the overall campus was to include the implementation and use of green technology; therefore, the first change is to install renewable energy solar panels at four locations within the EMU campus. These panels would provide energy from solar cells which in turn would be utilized by EMU. All equipment associated with the solar panels would be interiorly housed. The four locations are:

- Hartzler Library roof top
- University Commons parking lot
- Hillside Dormitory roof top
- Turf field parking lot (future)

Each roof top panel attaches directly to the roof and would vary between two and twelve inches in height depending on the roof and slope. The Hillside roof panels would actually be lower than the existing roof and would only be along the southern portion of the building. The Hartzler Library panels would have a southward facing slope and would not exceed five feet above the current building height of 40 feet. Thus, the overall building height for the library would be no greater than 45 feet.

The parking lot panels would rest on carport style support structures and vary in height from 8 ½ to 20 feet. This allows for vehicles to park underneath the panel structure. The support columns would be located such that all existing parking spaces are retained. The panels would run parallel with parking stalls and the 20 foot minimum drive aisles would remain open for vehicular access; therefore, the parking lots would remain usable. The solar panels proposed for the University Commons parking lot would maintain a five foot setback from the property line with Dogwood Drive. The five feet is from the edge of the actual panel and not the support structure, which would sit further back from the property line. On the 1998 master plan, the narrative proposed a landscape buffer, at a minimum of ten feet in width, consisting of suitable trees and / or shrubs, along the perimeter (adjacent to any public street), of the parking lot serving the University Commons. This landscape buffer is currently in place and would remain; however, the panels would over-hang the buffer by five feet. The turf parking lot is planned for future construction and the solar panels designed for this parking lot would be similar in design to the University Commons panels but would have a setback of 24 feet from the property line with Eastern Mennonite High School.

Two other changes are proposed with this amendment. A 30,000 square foot addition to the Suter Science Center, originally designed for the north and eastern sides of the building in 1998, is now planned along the south side. This addition is shown on the proposed amendment as crossing over a property line to the south. A subdivision to vacate the line would need to be completed prior to construction of the addition. The final change is the addition of a parcel into the I-1 overlay district. The house and property at 1110 Park Road were acquired by EMU after approval of the 1998 master plan and the applicant desires to incorporate them into the plan. The dwelling is currently being used for housing.

Harrisonburg Electric Commission has been in conversation with EMU regarding the solar panel project and from their standpoint there should not be any problems with the solar usage and interconnection.

In reviewing the Plan, it should be noted that this is a review of the development concept only and that each campus facility would require separate approval to insure compliance with building codes and with the City's design and construction standards.

Staff is supportive of the 2010 master plan amendment. The submitted changes are in keeping with the intentions of the I-1 district and staff does not foresee negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. Staff welcomes EMU's plan to incorporate green infrastructure and hopes it encourages similar technology in our area.

Chairman Jones asked if there were any questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing for the rezoning request and asked if the applicant or applicant's representative would like to speak.

Mr. Ed Blackwell with Blackwell Engineering said he is representing the applicants, Eastern Mennonite University. Also here tonight to answer any questions are Ron Piper with EMU; Eldon Kurtz with EMU facility management; Tony Smith, who actually works at EMU in the Business Department, and is also part of the team which will be installing the solar system; and Johann Zimmerman, structural engineer who will be doing the structural layout for the panels. What initiated this master plan upgrade were the solar panels; but, while doing that change there were changes to the Suter Science Center, which needed to be made and the inclusion of the new parcel. Staff has done an excellent job; however, if you have any further questions we would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Da'Mes asked if there were batteries associated with the solar panels and would they be housed in a building or separate facility.

Mr. Tony Smith, Co-Director of the MBA program with EMU and also with Secure Futures, the company who would be installing the solar powered generation system, said in this case we have had cooperation with the Harrisonburg Electric Commission so that the University would interconnect directly to the grid. Therefore, as the panels generate power, it will be used instantaneously to supply the electrical needs of the University. In a rare occasion when there is less demand than the panels are producing, HEC has agreed to accept that surplus power.

Chairman Jones asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the request. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Da'Mes moved to recommend approval of the amendment to the master plan. It is innovative and progressive, and I look forward to seeing it in place.

Mr. Snell seconded the motion.

Chairman Jones said there is a motion to recommend approval and a second. He then called for a voice vote.

All voted in favor of the motion. (5-0)

Chairman Jones said this will go before City Council on April 13, 2010.

Ordinance Amendments – Zoning Ordinance Amendments Sections 10-3-5, 16, 25, 48.3, 120, 122, 123, & 139

Chairman Jones read the request and asked staff to review.

Mr. Fletcher said staff is proposing modifications to several sections of the Zoning Ordinance for general updates and also to make revisions where word choice and other inaccuracies mislead zoning interpretations. Each modification is described below.

Section 10-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance lists the zoning districts that Harrisonburg regulates. The existing list is shown as follows:

R-1	Single-Family Residential District.
R-2	Residential District.
R-3	Multiple Dwelling Residential District.
R-4	Planned Unit Residential District.
R-5	Planned Single-Family Residential District.
MH-1	Manufactured Home Park District.
MH-2	Manufactured Home Subdivision District.
B-1A	Local Business District.
B-1	Central Business District
B-2	General Business District
M-1	General Industrial District
I-1	Institutional Overlay District

As you can see, this list has been out of date for some time as it does not include the U-R or R-P districts, which were added in 2001, and it displays an R-5, Planned Single Family Residential District, which has not been part of the Zoning Ordinance since 1998. Staff would like to update this section to depict the changes made to R-3 and to show the recently adopted districts, which include R-5, R-6, R-7, and the MX-U district. Staff recommends amending this section for the list to appear as follows:

R-1	Single-Family Residential District.
R-2	Residential District.
R-3	Multiple Dwelling Residential District.
R-3	Medium Density Residential District.
R-4	Planned Unit Residential District.
R-5	High Density Residential District.
R-6	Low Density Mixed Residential Planned Community District.
R-7	Medium Density Mixed Residential Planned Community District
MX-U	Mixed Use Planned Community District
MH-1	Manufactured Home Park District.
MH-2	Manufactured Home Subdivision District.
B-1A	Local Business District.
B-1	Central Business District
B-2	General Business District
M-1	General Industrial District
I-1	Institutional Overlay District
U-R	Urban Residential District
R-P	Residential-Professional District

Section 10-3-16 is within Article D, which explains the regulations for site plan reviews. Specifically, 10-3-16 (e) describes the length of time that approved site plans are valid. The existing regulation explains that approved site plans shall expire and become null and void unless a building permit is issued within one year. This section of the Zoning Ordinance has been superseded by the Code of Virginia for several years as the state code specifies that site plans are valid for five years. Staff recommends this section be updated to accurately display the site plan validation period. This section would be modified as shown:

- (e) An approved site plan shall expire and be null and void unless a building permit for the construction of the same substantial elements of the site plan has been issued within a period of ~~one year~~ *five years*.

Staff would like to make two, very small yet important modifications to Section 10-3-25 (3) of the Zoning Ordinance. This part of the Code defines the requirements for landscaping within parking lots. Currently, this section reads as follows:

- (3) Definition of “Landscaping for Parking Lots”: All parking lots for new buildings other than industrial sites requiring more than ten (10) parking spaces shall include well-defined and well maintained landscaped areas equal to at least fifteen (15) percent of the total area to be used for parking, maneuvering and driveways on site. Parking spaces shall be separated from all right-of-way lines and property lines by a landscaped border not less than ten (10) feet in width or appropriate visual elements such as walls or fencing, except along adjoining lot lines which lie within a shared parking arrangement approved by a special use permit allowing for a zero side yard setback. Landscaping interior to the parking area or within a thirty-foot perimeter of the parking area shall be permitted to count towards meeting the fifteen (15) percent requirement. It is required that hardy trees or shrubs which are regional species be planted or saved, and that all plantings and ground cover be either maintained or replaced.

The amendments would only occur within the first sentence and would include adding two commas. Currently, if one reads the first sentence there is more than one interpretation that can be drawn; however, staff has always interpreted this first sentence to mandate landscaping for parking lots for all developments that require more than 10 parking spaces, except those within industrial sites. For this reason, staff recommends more clearly demonstrating this regulation by placing a comma after the word “buildings” and by placing an additional comma after the word “sites.”

Section 10-3-48.3 lists the uses permitted by right within the recently adopted R-3, Medium Density Residential District. Specifically, subsection (10) permits hospitals, convalescent or nursing homes, funeral homes, medical offices and professional offices as defined by article T. Unfortunately, when the R-3 Medium Density district was approved, staff overlooked the wrong article reference. Subsection (10) should reference article “F,” the definitions portion of the Zoning Ordinance and not article “T,” which is the Modifications and Adjustments section. Staff simply recommends changing the article reference from “T” to “F.”

Section 10-3-120 is within Article U, which specifies the procedures and other regulations pertaining to amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. This section specifically grants the Planning Commission the authority to have a rehearing for properties that have been rezoned but have not initiated their plan of development within two years. Section 10-3-120 reads as follows:

Each request for amendment to this chapter, including the zoning map, shall be accompanied by a “plan of development” for the property included in the request, and shall have been reviewed by all applicable city officials before submission to the planning commission. If the application for rezoning is granted following the required public hearing procedure outline in section 10-3-105, the plan of development must be started within a period of two (2) years, and the proposed structure or structures, parking facilities, plantings and other landscaping must follow the plan of development introduced during the rezoning hearing. The planning commission will have a rehearing if the plan of development is not underway within two (2) years.

To staff’s knowledge, this section of the Zoning Ordinance has never been enforced and could arguably be illegal. We further believe this type of regulation is inequitable and burdensome on the property owner. Staff recommends removing this entire regulation and to reserve this section for future use.

Section 10-3-122, found within Article U Amendments and Changes, specifies details regarding rezoning application withdrawals. The text, intentions, and requirements put forth in this section are accurate except for the section reference at the end of the paragraph. At this time, Section 10-3-122 reads as follows:

Applications for a change in zoning may be withdrawn from consideration before the first notice of a public hearing thereon has been published and fees refunded if no publication cost is incurred. Application for a change in zoning which are withdrawn after the end of the public hearing shall be considered as denied for the purpose of one-year limitation or reconsideration as provided in section 10-3-107.

The intention of this reference is to refer the reader back to the “Reconsideration of Request,” segment of the Zoning Ordinance, which prior to the 1996 Zoning Ordinance overhaul, was 10-3-107. That section of the Code is now 10-3-121. Staff recommends simply updating this section by removing “10-3-107” and replacing it with the correct “10-3-121” reference.

Staff is proposing a third amendment within Article U; this modification falls within Section 10-3-123. Specifically, subsection (i) requires that proffers, approved during a rezoning, be recorded at the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court within 30 days after approval by City Council. Section 10-3-123 (i) reads as follows:

- (i) *Recordation of proffered conditions.* A certified copy of all ordinances accepting proffered conditions, together with a duly signed copy of the proffer statement, shall be recorded at the expense of the applicant in the name of the property owner as grantor in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court within thirty (30) days of council approval.

Subsection (i) was added in 2001 when staff recommended adding this requirement to the Zoning Ordinance contending that such requirement would help future property owners understand and acknowledge the zoning on their property. Although the intentions of this code were advantageous, the enforcement of this section was inconsistent and never became common practice. Staff believes this requirement is unnecessary and excessive. Staff recommends removing this subsection and requirement from the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Jones asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Da'Mes said if an investor is looking to purchase a property, how would they know if that property had proffers on it?

Mr. Fletcher said there are two ways you could identify that there are proffers. First, if you are looking up the property in the real estate division, they would accurately reflect on the tax card what the current zoning is. If it has a "C" on it, obviously that means it has proffers. Then you could also do your investigating at Community Development; we have the proffers on file within our department.

Mr. Da'Mes said this is not recorded. You would have to come to the City to obtain this information.

Mr. Fletcher replied none of the zoning districts are recorded in a deeded format.

Mr. Baugh said within legal practice there has always been a fairly clear distinction between a title issue and a zoning issue. To a "lay person" you may think all that stuff runs together; but it really does not. In fact, at any real estate closing of any title you have had done, among the fine print is a representation by the attorneys that no representation is made as to matters of zoning. Zoning is an area where people are typically on their own to investigate.

Mr. Chenault said if you require this of conditional zoning it should be required of all zoning classifications. The first place developers are going to go is to Community Development to check out zoning.

Mr. Da'Mes asked how do you hold a new buyer accountable when they purchase property.

Mr. Baugh said there is really no way to know without doing some homework for yourself. That is a lot of what our City staff does on a day-to-day basis, and that is handle inquiries about things like this.

Mr. Da'Mes said he has another question regarding Section 10-3-25 and the landscaping of parking lots. The ordinance reads "parking spaces shall include well defined, well maintained landscaping areas equal to at least fifteen percent of the total area to be used for parking." I do not see that with the newer big box retailers, unless you are including buffer areas or surrounding areas. This ordinance says fifteen percent within the parking area and it does not appear it is being applied.

Mrs. Banks replied that it does not read fifteen percent within the parking area itself, keep reading the requirement and it further explains. It does not have to be interior to the parking lot; you are allowed to count the thirty foot perimeter around the parking lot towards meeting the fifteen percent requirement. Fifteen percent is very, very small. It is verified on all site plans.

Mr. Fletcher said there have been a few times staff has discussed updating this; but, there has not been any support for it.

Mr. Da'Mes said I would like to see a certain percentage of the asphalt area having to be landscaped and maintained.

Mr. Fletcher said there is an ordinance we have worked on that needs some tweaking; but, it could be brought before Planning Commission if you are interested.

Mr. Snell said he recalls being a member of the landscape committee when he first became a planning commissioner.

Mrs. Turner said I think you are referring to the committee that ended up being the park committee. That was a landscaping ordinance committee which decided it did not want to change the landscape ordinance, so they decided to focus on putting some green space into a park.

Mr. Baugh said this commission made a decision to complete certain sections of the zoning ordinance and then make the Comprehensive Plan a priority. We recognized that landscaping was something that needed to be looked at, but there were other issues ahead of it.

Mr. Snell asked how do we want to handle these proposed ordinance amendments.

Chairman Jones said first we need to hold a public hearing on the amendments. He then opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone wishing to speak against the amendments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and asked for comments.

Mr. Snell moved to recommend approval of all seven of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Baugh seconded the motion.

Chairman Jones said there is a motion to recommend approval and a second. He then called for a voice vote.

All voted in favor of the motion. (5-0)

Unfinished Business

None.

Public Input

None.

Report of secretary and committees

Mrs. Banks said City Zoning Inspectors visited the Jefferson Street neighborhood recently and cited 35 violations consisting of inoperable vehicles and discarded materials. Next, they plan to visit the Forest Hills/JMU section of the City.

Mr. Da'Mes said in terms of my recent trip to Davis, CA as part of the Bike Committee, I will be presenting a visual presentation at our next meeting to give you an idea of our trip. Our trip was a very worthwhile endeavor. The people in the area were very receptive to us and really wanted to show what they have in the way of biking. We were fortunate to have a person join us on the trip who does videography for Discovery Channel and at no charge we were videoed throughout our trip. This video has been edited into a ten to fifteen minute documentary which can be seen in its entirety on May 24th.

Mr. Baugh said the City Council unanimously approved everything that Planning Commission had sent them from last month; a rezoning at 116 Reservoir Street and a rezoning and special use permits for 715 North Main Street. As well, we took up the matter of amending the definition of building and structure, which was also approved.

Other Matters

Mr. Fletcher said we have made progress for the Comprehensive Plan review. Stacy, Alison, and I met with Kai (Degner) to figure out how we want to proceed using the ideas that Planning Commission suggested last month. Kai really wanted to incorporate some of his dialogue and

discussion summit type ideas, which we are going utilize. We are not going to do the open space forum that he uses, but rather the world café design. We have a tag line, which I hope you like. It was offered by the Mayor and we all agree it is pretty good, the tag line is: Harrisonburg Listens. The location for all four of the input meetings is the Lucy F. Simms Center. The dates are alternating on Thursday and Wednesday evenings, as this will miss our regular Wednesday Planning Commission Meeting in May. The input discussions are set-up to take place between 7-9 p.m.

Mr. Snell said from my recollection of these meetings last time, it did not really justify that length of time. Perhaps we should just give a start time.

Mr. Fletcher said let me explain the world café concept. The plan is to have a different topic or theme each meeting. We will have an introduction session between 7-7:30; this will either be a short presentation by staff or some individual reading of the goals and strategies associated with the chapters being discussed. The next half hour will be the vision session of the meeting where you would talk about and discuss ideas within your individual groups. The next session after discussion within individual groups, is to read over the goals and objectives of the concurrent chapters and review the ideas that the group has. Finally, it is wrapped-up with the reporting session. This is where all of the individual groups report back to the main group or person who is facilitating the entire event. All of this information is collected and given to staff to put together and pick out any new ideas that need to be reflected in the Comprehensive Plan. All four nights will follow this same procedure. Once staff has reviewed everything and added chapters, sections, goals, objectives whatever is necessary, we will then present something more concrete back to you for review. Only after that will we go into the official public hearings; we anticipate that to be sometime in the fall. This is a preliminary time line and we need to know if you like what you are hearing.

We are also working with the public information officer about the advertising and campaign ideas to get the word out to the public. I have all the different ideas we are going to put forth and the timeline when these will be released. We plan to promote this through PSA's, press releases, an interview with Bob Corso, radio advertisements, the City Manager's radio program, flyers, and so forth.

Mr. Da'Mes said Martha Woodruff with WMRA would like to promote it.

Mr. Fletcher replied that she is on the list with the public information officer to be contacted. At this time you can start verbally talking to people about this and beginning to get the information out.

Mr. Chenault asked when do you get into the consideration of the map, specifically the land use map.

Mr. Fletcher said the maps will be on hand the night of the land use and transportation topic; that is why we have these two topics together.

Mr. Chenault said although we have not reviewed them or done anything with them. Are they just the existing maps?

Mrs. Turner said that after these input meetings have happened, during the summer sometime, Planning Commission will be working on these maps during work sessions for however long it may take. Staff has worked on updating the existing land use map and that will be a tool available for you to use. You will also have comments that people have made about whether or not they like where different type uses are located in the City or if they are thinking that a different type of use is

needed in the City. You can use these comments and any that you may have yourself to begin working on the maps.

Mr. Fletcher said we also have a transportation map that staff has made recommendations on and is already illustrating ideas of where new roads may be planned.

Mrs. Turner said you will use all of these things to work on the land use guide.

Chairman Jones asked if there was any further discussion on this matter. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Chairman William L. Jones, Jr.

Secretary, Alison Banks